

WILLIAM P. COLE  
Attorney for the United States,  
Acting Under Authority Conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 515  
California Bar No. 186772  
ROBERT S. HUIE  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
California Bar No. 237374  
880 Front Street, Room 6293  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel: (619) 546-7053  
Email: [Robert.Huie@usdoj.gov](mailto:Robert.Huie@usdoj.gov)

## Attorneys for the United States

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 14CR0388-MMA

Plaintiff.

1

JOSE SUSUMO AZANO MATSURA  
(1),

**RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO  
MOTION TO RECONSIDER ORDER  
DENYING DISCOVERY REGARDING  
THE RECUSAL OF THE UNITED  
STATES ATTORNEY**

Date: November 3, 2014

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Defendant.

Defendant Jose Susumo Azano moves the Court to reconsider its order denying Azano's motion for discovery concerning the United States Attorney's recusal. For several reasons, the Court should deny the motion.

1 First, Azano raises nothing new. He does not present any new facts, and he does  
2 not cite any intervening case law. While courts have inherent authority to reconsider  
3 rulings in criminal cases, the party moving for reconsideration should typically: (1)  
4 present newly discovered evidence; (2) demonstrate that the initial decision was clearly  
5 erroneous or manifestly unjust; (3) cite an intervening change in controlling law; or (4)  
6 present some other, highly unusual circumstances warranting reconsideration. United  
7 States v. Rosas, 2011 U.S. Dist. Lexis 74815, at \*1 (S.D. Cal. July 11, 2011)(citing  
8 School Dist. N. 1J Multnomah Cty. v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993)).  
9  
10 Azano does the opposite: he cites virtually all the same cases and makes the same  
11 arguments. He identify no error or injustice, let alone clear error or manifest injustice.  
12  
13 There is no reason for the Court to reconsider its order. See Millennium Labs., Inc. v.  
14 Allied World Assurance Co., 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145934, at \*2 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 10,  
15 2014)(motion for reconsideration “does not give parties ‘a second bite at the  
16 apple’”)(citation omitted).  
17  
18

19 Second, while Azano again stresses the importance of a “disinterested prosecutor,”  
20 he presents no facts suggesting that the prosecutors handling this case are anything other  
21 than disinterested. Beyond making the general observation that United States Attorney  
22 Duffy is the “boss” of the office, Azano does not allege – much less present any facts  
23 suggesting – that United States Attorney Duffy is handling this case, influencing this  
24  
25

1 case, giving direction on this case, or even receiving briefings on this case. In fact, she is  
2 not.

3 Third, effectively conceding that Rule 16 does not support his motion, Azano again  
4 seeks to pound a square peg into the round hole of Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83  
5 (1963). But Brady applies to evidence “material to either guilt or to punishment.” Brady,  
6 373 U.S. at 87. The reasons for United States Attorney Duffy’s *non-involvement* in this  
7 case are, of course, not material to Azano’s guilt or punishment. Indeed, Azano cites no  
8 case holding that Brady compels discovery of the reasons for a prosecutor’s recusal from  
9 a case.

12       But even assuming for argument’s sake that Brady applies to whether the  
13 prosecutor is “disinterested,” its only feasible application would be to the attorneys who  
14 are, in fact, prosecuting the case. As noted, however, Azano proffers no facts suggesting  
15 that the assigned prosecutors are anything other than disinterested. Thus, even assuming  
16 that Brady could theoretically apply, Azano fails to meet his initial burden of producing  
17

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

1 some evidence to support an inference that the government possesses undisclosed  
2 material favorable to the defense.

3 Dated: October 27, 2014

4 Respectfully submitted,

5 */s/William P. Cole*  
6 WILLIAM P. COLE  
7 Attorney for the United States,  
8 Acting under Authority Conferred  
9 By 28 U.S.C. § 515

10 ROBERT S. HUIE  
11 Assistant U.S. Attorney